

Exhibit 29

(b)(6)

From: [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, June 27, 2002 6:03 PM
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: RE: CARE OF USCIT DETAINEE

Thank you [redacted] I'll make it so Sir.
V/R, [redacted]

-----Original Message-----
From: [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, June 27, 2002 5:38 PM
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: RE: CARE OF USCIT DETAINEE

[redacted] on Hamdi and the playing cards. He can have his deck. Hope this helps. I realize it's little enough, but it's the best we can do right now. The answer on the game boy is NO for now. I am working with the CTF 160 guys and JFCOM to get a coherent policy.
No movement on mail.

[redacted] (b)(6)

-----Original Message-----
From: [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, June 27, 2002 4:15 PM
To: [redacted]
Subject: RE: CARE OF USCIT DETAINEE

Sorry [redacted] for the delayed response, as it has been one of those non-stop days. Thank you Sir for the follow-up, hope you understand I am trying to keep this individual in the box and lessen the potential for any foolish action on his part (I am speaking of the potential for a hunger strike). This came up at X-Ray and drew all kinds of media attention and this individual made mention of his intentions to do the same thing here, in time. As you know, we control the media here at my facility, but if the medical folks get involved with something of a hunger strike nature, don't know for certain we could control what got outside the wire. Trying to stay ahead of as many potential problems as possible, but sometimes I feel like I'm in a mine field. By the way Sir, per Webster's Vol. II, Penuckle.

[redacted] V/R, [redacted] (b)(6)

-----Original Message-----
From: [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 2002 5:57 PM
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: RE: CARE OF USCIT DETAINEE

[redacted] answers to your questions: the two letters are still at CTF 160/170 for reevaluation. We engaged on Monday and will engage again tomorrow. I will answer your request to give a pinocle (how the heck do you spell that?) deck to Hamdi tomorrow before noon. As for the unopened legal correspondence, the joint staff and DOD GC/DEPSECDEF still have that for action - continue to accumulate. No one thinks these are small issues - quite the contrary - which is why we are seeing the very highest levels of Government considering the answers.

Also pending are Hamdi's letters to his family. I will ping CTF 160 again on that issue tomorrow. I have the CINC's decisions, pending CTF 160 review.

[redacted] (b)(6)

-----Original Message-----
From: [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 2002 4:28 PM
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: CARE OF USCIT DETAINEE

Good evening [redacted] saw the detainee this morning during regular rounds. He is going through another depression stage, as he is continuing to question how much long he going to be here and why he has not been afforded to meet with a lawyer. He questions why when requests are made, it takes so long for a

(b)(6)

From: []
Sent: Friday, May 17, 2002 7:16 AM []
To: []
Cc: []
Subject: RE: Letter from Federal Public Defender []

(b)(6)

Good morning [] hold the letter and deny access if the FPD were to show up at my facility, until otherwise directed.
[] V/R, []

-----Original Message-----
From: []
Sent: Friday, May 17, 2002 7:05 AM []
To: []
Cc: []
Subject: FW: Letter from Federal Public Defender []

(b)(6)

ATTORNEY WORKPRODUCT - DO NOT RELEASE

(b)(6)

Nothing new here, but guidance from [] via DOD GC staff attorney, that we keep letter locked up and deny access to detainee if FPD happens to show up at the brig. [] is the [] official responsible for arguing the federal government's cases before the federal courts, including the Supreme Court.) Thanks, V/r []

-----Original Message-----
From: []
Sent: Friday, May 17, 2002 6:54 AM []
To: []
Cc: []

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

Subject: RE: Letter from Federal Public Defender []

(b)(6)

Here is the current guidance from [] []

-----Original Message-----
From: []
Sent: Thursday, May 16, 2002 3:34 PM []
To: []
Cc: []
Subject: RE: Letter from Federal Public Defender []

(b)(6)

We should think about it more, and we need to see OLC's memo on the issue, but for now I would maintain the status quo, i.e., no letter and no access. [] (b)(6)

-----Original Message-----
From: []
Sent: Thursday, May 16, 2002 3:20 PM []
To: []
Cc: []
Subject: FW: Letter from Federal Public Defender []

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

Is there an issue about holding the letter from the Federal Public Defender, given that the court has appointed the FPD as counsel for Hamdi? Similarly, what if the FPD shows up at the door of the brig?

Thanks.